

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions and suggestions of the study. It concludes the findings and discussions elaborated in the previous chapter. It also provides suggestions for the future studies.

5.1 Conclusions

This present study has examined cases of observance and non-observance of maxims by children with ASD. It has also investigated the types of non-observance of maxims that are committed, and possible reasons that cause the cases of non-observance of maxims.

Based on the findings and discussions, it is discovered that children with ASD most of the time observes the four maxims, i.e. maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner, with maxim of relation as the most frequently observed maxim. Nevertheless, there are also several cases of non-observance of maxims performed by both children in a significantly smaller number compared to the cases of observance of maxims. The most frequently broken maxim by both participants is maxim of quantity. The types of non-observance of maxims that are committed are *flouting*, *infringing*, *violating*, and *opting out*. Meanwhile, the possible reasons that cause the non-observance of maxims are reasons such as imperfect command of language, impaired speaking performance, intention to create jokes and implicature, attempt to avoid discomfort, and reasons related to characteristics of children with ASD which include echolalia, unusual attachments to objects, having continuous routine, and stereotypes in thought.

The explanation above reveals that children with ASD most of the time manage to create successful communication, which is evidenced by the significant number of the observance of maxims. In other words, in the context of daily conversations, they generally produce utterances that are true, adequate, relevant,

brief, and clear. Yet, like people in general commonly do, there are several infrequent cases where they fail to make successful communication. More specifically, in those cases, they fail because their utterances are rather unclear and not brief, which is due to the impaired performance when speaking, *echolalia*, and other characteristics of individuals with ASD. In addition, there are also cases where their interlocutors' goals in communication are not fulfilled because the children make attempts to avoid uncomfortable situations, crack jokes, and generate another meaning.

Furthermore, conversational reciprocity by both children is lacking. It means that they rarely give feedbacks or comments to their interlocutors or start a new topic of conversation. This is as supported by Lord et al., 2000; de Villiers et al, 2007; and Wallace, 2011 who state that children with ASD lack reciprocity in conversation. Philofsky and Hepburn (as cited in Wallace, 2011) add that children with ASD have difficulty in initiating interactions with other people. As a matter of fact, both children with ASD in this present study hardly ever start or sustain the conversation, neither with their teachers nor with their friends. When speech does occur, it is the teachers who start and keep the conversations going.

5.2 Suggestions

Related to this study, there are suggestions for future studies. Firstly, as the present study only involves individuals who are children, future studies can involve individuals whose ages are ranging. For example, it can involve children, teenagers, and adults, so that it can present performances of various age groups.

The second suggestion is that future studies can involve more participants, i.e. more boys and girls, or more males and females. Besides using theory of Autism Spectrum Disorder, it can also consider to use theory of gender. That way, various data can be obtained and the study can be a gender study.

Another suggestion is that as this present study focuses only on children with ASD, future studies can consider involving both people with special needs (e.g. people with ASD) and people in general as the participants. Therefore, differences and probably influences in observing and breaking maxims between the two can be discovered.

The last suggestion is that in addition to using theory of Cooperative Principle by Grice (1975) as the main theory, future studies can also be conducted by using theory of Politeness Principles by Lakoff (1973) as the supporting theory. Thus, various and fruitful findings about influences of politeness on observance of maxims can be discovered.